

FEB. 24. 2009 4:08PM

HARRINGTON & SMITH

NO. 759 P. 1

RECEIVED  
CENTRAL FAX CENTER

FEB 24 2009

IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

Application No.: 10/518,222 Confirmation No.: 5724

Applicant(s): DiRusso et al.

Filed: 12/15/2004

Art Unit: 3739

Examiner: Kasztejna, Matthew John

Title: Flexible Endoscope

Attorney Docket No.: 012A.0063.U1(US)

Customer No.: 29,683

Commissioner For Patents  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, VA 22313-1450

Response To Office Action

Sir:

This is in response to the Office Action mailed 12/22/2008 in regard to the above-identified patent application.

Claims 1-6, 9-12 and 19-20 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Boury (US 5,916,147). Claims 7-8 and 13-14 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Boury (US 5,916,147) in view of Ogura et al. (US 6,639,213). Claims 15-17 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Boury (US 5,916,147) in view of Grabover et al. (US 5,938,588). The examiner is requested to reconsider these rejections.

Column 7, lines 46-52 of Boury clearly describes the ability to curve the catheter in multiple planes with two distinct arcs 36A and 36B, each lying in a different plane. Column 5, lines 40-45 clearly describes the four control wires 34A-D being attached to the different nodes 32A-D as the examiner